

THE MINORITY OF ONE

Independent Monthly Publication, Dedicated to the Elimination of All Thought Restrictions Except for the Truth

"There was truth and there was untruth, and if you clung to the truth even against the whole world, you were not mad."—GEORGE ORWELL

Vol. II, No. 4 (5)

Copyright, 1960
THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC.

Address for subscriptions and correspondence:
P. O. Box 6594, Richmond 30, Va.

Editor:
M. S. Arnone

April, 1960

Adenauer's Proxy

Germany Back to May 10, 1941

On May 10, 1941 Hitler's successor-designate, Rudolf Hess, parachuted into Scotland in a vain attempt to stop the Anglo-German war and turn the forces of the newly reconciled parties against the Soviet Union. Since then, history has written quite a few chapters: Germany surrendered unconditionally and was demilitarized, while yesterday's allies became irreconcilable antagonists.

The circumstances under which Germany was not only allowed but also prompted to rearm are obscured by propagandistic claims and counter-claims. It is an uncontested fact, however, that even before Ger-

many's disarmament was decided upon in Potsdam and even before World War II was over, certain Western circles were inclined to take another look at Rudolf Hess's mission. Winston Churchill's self-recorded contemplations are quite revealing on this matter.

It was not long after the Potsdam agreements were signed that Rudolf Hess's message became in substance the leading light of Western policy with respect to Germany. German nationalism has been encouraged with all the determination and aid our Government could muster. Nor have we had any objections to German vindictiveness, provided it could be diverted away from us.

Of course, there are many differences between Dr. Konrad Adenauer and Adolf Hitler, the main difference being that Adenauer is pro-American, at least for as long as necessary to rearm West Germany. There are other differences: Adenauer respects certain human rights for which Hitler had no regard at all. But there are also significant similarities: in foreign affairs both relied, with equal unscrupulousness, on the bare might of German arms.

In substance, Dr. Adenauer's philosophy, which he has been pursuing with iron-like consistency, is that the worse the international situation the better for Germany. He is the apolitical politician, pursuing military rather than political policies. He favors any situation which would "justify" additional strength for West Germany. Adenauer does not believe the time to be ripe for defining German goals—rather he conceives this to be a preparatory period during which German forces are built and consolidated.

This explains Adenauer's almost automatic opposition to any diplomatic initiative that might relax international tension. While paying lip service to
(Continued on page 14)

U.S.A., U.S.S.R.: THE "CLASSLESS" SOCIETIES

A socio-economic division of the world into communist and capitalistic nations is an erroneous oversimplification of a complex dichotomy within which individual nations display varied structures. In the communist camp they vary from the "advanced" socialism of the Soviet Union to the still experimental and less uniform stage of the Chinese revolution and the East-European nations. In the "capitalistic" camp the systems are even more diversified: they consist of the uniquely American version versus the

capitalism of the British, French, and other nations that has long since resigned itself to partial state intervention and compromise with the Welfare State, the mixed economy of Sweden which includes sectors of cooperative syndicalism, Israel with its communistic sectors purely in the economic sense, and the wide array of newly independent nations which are fervently experimenting along the lines of the Swedish and Israeli tendencies.

Among all these various economic systems there are only two countries which claim to be classless: the United States and the Soviet Union. To be exact, there is a difference between their respective claims: while the Soviet Union claims to be classless, the United States concedes the existence of socio-economic classes but contends their interests to complement each other harmoniously for the spontaneous good of all.

The Soviet claim derives from a doctrinaire refusal to evaluate reality as it actually developed in the course of the communist experiment, clinging to theories perceived in the abstract about a century ago. The fallacy of this has been most effectively exposed by the former theoretician of Yu-

goslav Communists, Milovan Djilas, in his classic work, *The New Class*.*

The American theory of spontaneous harmony among classes, which is a variation of the Soviet claim to classlessness, derives from no doctrinaire consistency. The classic theoreticians of free enterprise never maintained that a natural harmony existed among socio-economic groups; some of them, like Ricardo, even attempted to trace the pattern of their conflicts and encounters. Natural compliance among classes is modern-day propaganda rather than sociological and economic fact.

What this unscientific contention has come to serve is best illustrated by its principal achievement: American labor has been deprived of political representation and effectiveness. Although labor is organized in trade unions, the unions themselves are effectively apoliticized. Not only are they prevented from establishing themselves as, or becoming a part of, a political party; the law even suppresses direct political activity on their part: provisions of the Taft-Hartley law forbid contributions

* Published by Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1957.

(Continued on page 2)

A Visit is Not a Mission

The trouble with the kind of tour President Eisenhower recently made to Latin America is that not many of them can be arranged. The psychological impact of such ceremonial, popular-appeal visits is in direct proportion to their infrequency. No head of state can afford to visit "the people" of another country too often lest, "*familiarity breeding contempt*", he would diminish his prestige rather than enhance it. Historically such ceremonial visits have been reserved to dramatize extremely important political decisions, often basic reversals of policy.

That President Eisenhower's tour came towards the end of his term of office rather than at its beginning implies that it dramatized no particularly significant political step. Its timing may well have had more to do with our domestic presidential campaign than with actual matters of foreign policy.

That the deteriorating relations between this country and Latin America warranted some gesture on our part was amply and sadly dramatized during Vice-President Nixon's visit to our "neighbors" in 1958. However, the gesture the Administration decided upon—the President's visit—was directed more to the American voter than to the host countries. The unforgettably sad impression Nixon's visit left on American public opinion called for a restoration of the illusion of American prestige abroad. The "*I will go to Korea!*" pledge of eight years ago was paraphrased to "*I will go to Latin America!*" and once more Eisenhower has emerged as a combination of the flying Dutchman and the magician-wizard.

As far as the mending of foreign relations is concerned, the President's tour was fatally afflicted by inertia, providing nothing but airy and meaningless promises. His platitudinous wishes for the economic well-being of all were no substitute for overdue changes in this country's tariff policies.

What Latin America needs more than outright economic help, which President Eisenhower was hardly eager to promise anyway, is a reversal of our stifling tariff policies with respect to its agricultural products and raw materials. It is of no avail to pretend that we do not understand what Latin Americans mean when they talk about American imperialism. The centralization of capital investments in Latin America in American hands, accompanied by a high U. S. wall of custom protection, constitutes colonialism even if its means of protection is not territorial conquest.

Not less inert was President Eisenhower's tour in the political sense. Our long history of supporting corrupt dictatorships is not invalidated by calling those who protest against it "*Communists!*". The Latin Americans have had a

long experience with American-owned companies, which own so much of the fertile soil as well as their power, telephone, transportation and other facilities, and they thoroughly appreciate the vested interests these companies have in preserving plutocratic regimes. Nothing President Eisenhower said or did during his tour indicated any readiness of his Administration to draw a line between the interests of those American companies and the national interests of the United States.

In view of this inertia it seems that the only "*achievement*" the President can boast is the threatened breach of diplomatic relations between Uruguay and the Soviet Union.

Little but partisan prudence motivated this visit without any significant mission. When the disappointment takes effect, President Eisenhower will not be around to pay the price, and whatever comfort his successor-designate derives meanwhile will be as irrevocable as the outcome of the forthcoming elections.

THE MINORITY OF ONE INDEPENDENT MONTHLY PUBLICATION

published by:

THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC.

P. O. Box 6594

Richmond 30, Va.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

	1 yr.	2 yrs.
United States	\$5.00	\$9.00
Canada	\$5.25	\$9.50

Other foreign subscription rates
submitted at request.

Material published herein may be reproduced upon written permission from THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC., provided proper credit is given. Unsigned contributions are written by M. S. Armoni.

NO COMMERCIAL ADVERTISING ACCEPTED

Regrettably, this publication is printed in a not unionized plant due to the local unavailability of a unionized printing plant.

The "Classless" Societies

(Continued from page 1)

to political campaigns from unions' general funds. Political involvement on the part of trade unions is considered so illegitimate that any activity, when construed as such, elicits apologetic statements on the part of labor leaders.

Among the nations ideologically closest to us, the United States is the only one whose parliament boasts no labor representation. A United States parliamentarian, elected as a result of intricate pre-election arrangements between various groups of vested interests, appears as a parliamentarian at large, without specifically and officially representing a particular social group. Any attempt to make himself the official spokesman of labor would be regarded as most illegitimate.

Fascism, while enforcing far reaching compromises on the part of the propertied classes, has as its principal objective the complete apolitization of labor. Notwithstanding all the differences between fascism and the U. S. system, the apolitization of labor constitutes a definite and very significant fascist inroad into American life.

This scheme not only deprives the most numerous segment of American society of direct political expression but also perverts our political democracy. In its structural mechanics as well as in its political consequences it resembles the early medieval parliaments, when land ownership was a prerequisite for voting rights, depriving the great majority of the populace of parliamentary representation. And although, in the American version, popular elections are held, the class composure of the legislature is prejudiced in advance. The illusion of universal suffrage is maintained but, at the same time, the rule by a class minority is being perpetuated.

The advocates of this system resort to rationalizations which closely resemble the arguments of the Communists in their defense of the one-party system. They maintain that the lack of class representation in the Congress is not an imposed arrangement but truly reflects a spontaneous harmony among the classes of American society. Similarly, the Soviet Communists claim their one-party system to reflect a voluntary compliance of all Soviet citizens who allegedly lack any desire for a second party.

Were this a sincere though mistaken contention, the system would not prevent class representation but rather allow it in the composure of the Congress, confident that such class representation would express the alleged harmony. The prevailing arrangement is reminiscent of the colonialist argument which denies independence to a colonial people under the pretext that the colonial people themselves do not aspire to it. At the same time, however, the colonial power is not ready to have its evaluation of the popular sentiment tested in a free self-determining referendum.

Numerous and organized as American labor is, it is denied effective political tools for exercising public influence.

It is no coincidence that the composure of the United States Congress reveals an extremely one-sided picture of class recruitment. No practicing laborers or farmers (as opposed to farming businessmen) are to be found among its members. The legal requirements and the practical campaign mechanics for appearing on the ballot nullify the chances of anyone lacking the support of specific lobbies. The Congress of the United States is a most effectively segregated arena, in which class discrimination prevails with no less effectiveness than racial discrimination in the deep South.

Both the Soviet claim to a classless society and the American claim to class harmony are in obvious contradiction to the prevailing situations. Official doctrine, in both cases, has only one possible objective—to eliminate the political influence of those segments of society that might challenge the prevailing system if given the right of political expression. In both cases, the underlying intention is to perpetuate the ruling oligarchy. Neither party, however, misses an opportunity to delude the citizen with an acceptable picture of an unacceptable situation.

DEMOCRACY and REFERENDUM

Were democracy no more than a procedure for reaching decisions on public affairs, the Bill of Rights and the Constitution need never have been written. Instead, the Founding Fathers could have established the law of the land in a single sentence: "*All decisions of this nation shall be made in accordance with the unrestricted wishes of the majority of citizens.*"

The numerous principles embodied in the Bill of Rights and the many articles and amendments of the Constitution were necessary because there was no inclination to give such sweeping powers to the majority. Its rights and prerogatives have been clearly restricted in many domains; and many courses of action, even if sponsored or backed by a large majority of the people, can be ruled illegal.

Were democracy no more than a voting technique that gives precedence to majority decisions, Hitler's ascent to power and his reign could be regarded as perfectly democratic acts; his rule was unquestionably supported by a majority within the German nation.

Such a conception of democracy, which unfortunately is frequently adhered to, reflects a primitive and brutal approach to public matters. It is a political paraphrasing of *might is right* that chooses to ignore criteria of quality and bases its legitimacy on a purely quantitative approach. In substance, it seeks to decide all public issues on the merits of the physical strength behind each recommendation. Although the actual physical wrestling match between opponents never takes place, the one who commands the most muscles is still the victor.

David and Goliath saved their respective peoples from bloodshed by taking on each other, while technical democracy averts bloodshed between advocates of opposing views by surveying the physical forces behind each and speculating on the hypothetical victor. He is then proclaimed the victor although no battle took place.

Certainly, even such a way of solving controversies represents a civilized development in relation to a still more primitive stage in which no solution could be reached except by actually killing the opponent. But the modern world could hardly boast of an achievement that goes only one step beyond ultimate primitivism and brutality. This is why public policies are not adjudicated as democratic or anti-democratic only in relation to the number of votes behind them. A certain course of action may be anti-democratic even if a great majority of citizens favor it, and the deeds of the small German anti-Nazi

underground served democracy in spite of its being a minority course.

The bankruptcy of those inclined to regard any and all majority rule as democratic is further evidenced by the fact that many decisions that seem to have been made by a majority represent, in actuality, a quite indefinite picture of public sentiment. Adhering to the majority vote as the sole principle of democracy would require an almost impossible definition of what constitutes a majority vote. If, for instance, the majority of citizens cast their vote for a specific course of action as a result of being misled by their leadership, would such a decision be considered a democratic one? Then too, who would be authorized to judge, and by what criteria, whether the majority vote resulted from misrepresentation? And what remedial steps would be taken in such a case?

Another complication of what initially might have occurred as the simplest system of government enters the picture through the need to define the electorate which, in the process of decision making, splits into a "*majority*" and a "*minority*". For instance, if two communities are involved in a conflict of interests and each conducts a referendum within its sphere of jurisdiction, chances are that each of the two irreconcilable communities could claim to represent a "*majority*". Even a referendum commonly conducted by both communities would not necessarily provide a democratic solution: a nation of, let's say fifty million people, could demand the annexation of its five-million-people neighbor, agree to leaving the decision up to a free referendum of both nations and then reinforce its demand on the basis that it reflects the wishes of a vast majority of both nations.

These situations are not purely speculative and hypothetical. Rather they represent events that have occurred in both domestic and international problems. The outcome of many a popular vote or election has been determined either by a lack of knowledge among the electorate or by its being intentionally misled; and in the international arena decisions are hardly ever reached on other merits than the potential physical might backing them.

The public leader's relationship to the citizen in a democratic society is more intricate than the term "*public servant*" would seem to imply. In his position of power, secret information and influence, he is not merely the executioner of public sentiment but also its architect and manipulator. The means for this range from withholding relevant, perhaps decisive, data from the electorate to creat-

ing a public image of problems so as to precondition public sentiment in favor of a course advocated by the leader.

But even if all these obscure handicaps did not exist, and a clearcut, unquestionable majority decision could be reached on any particular issue, no mistake is invalidated just because a majority of people participate in it. Two plus two is not three, even if a majority of the world's population claims it to be true. The very development of civilization proves that majority opinions are not necessarily the right ones; all progress begins with the questioning of an established "*truth*", and were it not for such perpetually occurring revolutions of the mind, we would still be living in caves. There is no basis for assuming that the collective intelligence exceeds the individual intelligence and two people may err as easily as one. Two individuals whose IQ is 100 do not add up to a collective IQ of 200.

An unrestricted majority decision, even if arrived at fairly, would still pose no guarantee of correctness, intelligence and propriety. At the very best it would represent a system of solving controversies without bloodshed but also without assurance that the right decisions would be reached.

A truly democratic society is measured by the checks on the majority's power. True democracy not only is not total license of the majority but, on the contrary, it imposes strict rules and limitations on that license. The great advent of democracy—the French Revolution—was anything but an expedient mechanism for decision making. Its banner was not "*Let the majority decide!*" but "*Liberte! Egalite! Fraternite!*" Only the application of these principles constitutes the democratic act, whether it is executed by a majority or a minority of citizens. Only such a system, embodying moral and social principles rather than exhausting itself in procedural mechanics, represents the democratic idea.

Democracy's most vulnerable weakness lies in the failure of any great visionary to develop an ideology or *Weltanschauung* that clearly permeates the mechanics of democratic decision making with the high principles of tolerance and humaneness, thereby establishing a goal for man's inspiration that would balance the negative value of preventing oppression with positive spiritual values. It is this deprivation which so often has enabled crusaders for the darkest and most inhumane ends to mock democracy by exploiting it as nothing more than a procedural system of decision making.

One of the most troublesome aspects of our vast, unwieldy governments today is the increasing distance which the private individual feels between himself and the inscrutable bureaucracy which supposedly represents his best interests, through the majority view. Of course, democracy is notable in that although it does impose a majority programme, it still tolerates minorities, and actually depends upon them for its vitality. Yet, so removed have individuals become from prime fields of action that any kind of real

"Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in Mankind; And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; It tolls for thee."

—John Donne

COMMITMENT: A Personal Venture

By JEANNE S. BAGBY

interchange, dialogue or other human relationship has become increasingly impossible. We all recognize the uselessness of writing to the President about anything, though we may still indulge in the activity for its symbolical value; and even from our legislative representatives we seldom receive more than a stereotyped reply, if we do not represent some vast lobby or vested interest. There is no longer any channel in which the man-to-man actuality of give-and-take envisioned in America's early days can be supported. The cracker-barrel is almost extinct. We have been reduced to numerals on a voting machine, ciphers at the Census Bureau and precious digits enfolded in the mighty arms of the Bureau of Internal Revenue.

Yet this is but an inevitable dilemma of the Mass. The laws of physics uphold statistical measurement for atoms and humans alike, notwithstanding the absolute unpredictability of any given atom or human. Only thus can the huge machinery of government retain an ascendancy of order against the constant encroachings of chaos. Is it any wonder that most citizens accept cipher-status as a necessary evil, or at the mass level—as a refuge against the complexities of modern existence? In compensation, we manifest a supremely egotistical personalism—a tiny grasshopper chorus of shrill protest from those still capable of expression. In the arts, we observe a continual (and despairing) emphasis upon the value of the individual, whether as content or as part of the artist's exclusive obscurity of technique. Philosophers continue to vituperate from their quadrangles. In other fields, we find the cult of the Personality blossoming in astonishing variety. But most of the negativism of this rather desperate resistance to cipherism can well be excused or tolerated if we remember that it reflects a sincerely human aspiration toward commitment: a mature involvement with the real issues of life which is greatly frustrated by the Mass Machine.

For truly, most people who ripen past the point of childish self-interest do earnestly wish to play as active and responsible a part in life, on all its levels, as possible. What to do when the potential for individual initiative and cooperation is severely limited? Many great talents are doubtless buried in business, since our capitalist system still offers a variety of outlets for such expression. But it is all too frequent that the challenge of business, with its unceasing pressure of competition, fails to satisfy those whose vision extends to higher concepts of world cooperation and harmonious living—visions, indeed, which have been nobly expressed in our very Constitution, but which seem to have faded behind our present hysterical pursuit of happiness. The remaining choices of education, science, religion or government invite the more cloistered temperament and impose even stricter limitations upon the individualist.

The fact remains, however, that in each generation a surprising number of individuals manage to resist mass pres-

sure and find some way of personal interaction, usually expressing the traditional beliefs of the perennial minority, but determined primarily on the faith that such action constitutes an ultimate value incommensurate with its transient apparent effects. Of such is the witness of great individualists of our times: Albert Schweitzer, Lord Bertrand Russell, Simone Weil. Others have become the focal points for popular action: Gandhi, Martin Luther King, Michael Scott. These and many others form a kind of barricade against creeping cipherism which the idealist can use in his own defence as he extends his first hesitant feelers into the sphere of responsible minority action.

The first fact he must face, of course, is the one reflected in the title of this publication; all minorities begin with the minority of one, the individual decision. Those who run excitedly about from one altruistic group to another seldom find a lasting fulfillment of purpose and usually sink into the purely verbal comforts of teapot anarchism. It remains to the youthful idealists of each generation to try their wings against injustice, intolerance and coercion; and no matter how many fall back unwinged into the purely practical life, there will always be a significant few who find the altitude a permanent exhilaration. Of these there will also be a number unable to relate their vision successfully with action, remaining in the schizophrenic kind of limbo inhabited by ineffectual intellectuals and devotees to lost causes. The active remainder soon have their names inscribed in the rolls of various liberal groups; there is a kind of Society of the Committed which could be rostered from the mastheads of current altruistic appeals and the subscription lists of progressive publications. From time to time, some of these are eliminated by the pressures of passing hysterias and either incarcerated by the Machine or reduced to such questionable status by smear methods that they voluntarily withhold their support to prevent disrepute to their associates.

In any case, despite a difficult national and world climate featuring heavy propaganda fogs and increasingly humid coercion, the individualist still has a multitude of semi-respectable directions in which he may test his potential for personal commitment. The simplest route is to align with some group of traditional standing, such as the Quakers, who manage to accomplish an amazing amount of work very quietly under the aegis of religious freedom. Political extremists may gravitate to groups of whatever degree of pinkness they feel best. Pacifists may align with groups either religious or political in context, while artists may support creative community ventures. Plain humanistic altruists will find large numbers of community services, ethical unions and non-governmental agencies awaiting their energies. And in all of these activities are a large number of roles possible, embracing the most timid and the most adventuresome alike. The field is indeed more vital and comprehensive than the Machine and its spokesman, Mass Entertainment (mistakenly called Communications), would have us believe.

JEANNE S. BAGBY is a free-lance writer, who publishes extensively in a great number of American periodicals.

How Clean is "Clean"?

The current campaign against corruption, which started with the exposure of "rigged" television quiz programs, will sooner or later be over. With each new stage of the campaign the general public becomes agitated and angry, but at the same time it is gaining an illusion of cleansing itself. When the balance sheet of the campaign to uproot payola, bribes, and misrepresentation is drawn, it will be accompanied by a sigh of relief and a feeling of achievement. "It was a sad spectacle", we will comment, "to have all that dirty linen laundered in the open, but we are that much better off for doing it and now our house is clean". Somebody will probably suggest, and we will wholeheartedly agree that blessed is the country that, in spite of corruption, has enough "freedom" to fight it and to eliminate it. Then, we will all congratulate each other, shake each other's hands and return to business as usual. In the final scene of the national drama turned national victory, a Billy Graham will rise to the pulpit and, prophetically invoking Providence, will hail the rejuvenation of the spirit.

In actuality the "cleansing campaign" will leave us dirtier than ever, not because no trash will have been swept off the avenues of our public life, but because a delusion will have been created that whatever survived is clean and honest. Unfortunately, any campaign against corruption is bound to leave the real, all-embracing sources of corruption untouched.

The practices presently being branded as dishonest are but peripheral tributaries to the main stream which our authorities are reluctant to take a searching, objective look at. To sieve the main stream, and eliminate from it the scum, would require basic and far-reaching reforms, which our "reformers" are not inclined to undertake nor concede the need for.

The source of this basic corruption, which in spite of "cleansing" campaigns remains untouched, is in the overall prevailing philosophy that establishes profits as the exclusive criterion of admissibility and legitimacy, superceding all standards of public ethics. Profits has transcended its meaning as an economic term and become a public philosophy that controls every aspect of our thinking and indeed dominates our entire civilization.

According to this "philosophy" the ultimate test of any public practice is profitability. Any public measure is justifiable as a source of profits for someone. Out of this "philosophy" have come the business malpractices recently exposed. Any advertising or sales method that obviously made use of lies and cheating found its sanction in its ability to produce financial profits. All that was needed to win an

argument advocating the use of misrepresentation was to prove that financial profits could not be secured otherwise. No one would suggest that the making of profits should be given up. If one could prove that profits were obtainable without cheating, he would gain attentive ears. No one, however, would subscribe to the proposition that profits should be pursued *only* if they could be obtained honestly, in compliance with certain abstract ethical values. In other words, all other considerations and criteria were subordinated to profits.

Ask any business executive whether it is ethical to promote prostitution in our society and surely his answer would be "No!". When, however, the same dilemma arises in a context involving financial profits for him, the answer would be less absolute. There can be little doubt that the many business executives responsible for conceiving of, planning and executing the use of prostitution as a "moral"-building part of a business convention, are in their personal lives orthodox puritans. Their puritanism "had" to give way, however, when the moral compromise bore a promise of good business—an ultimate increase in profits.

In defiance of all logic and consistency we depart on a course against certain immoral business practices, but at the same time individuals who proved their ingenuity by devising such practices become national celebrities. We may slam the door in the face of an obnoxiously persistent field-salesman, we may complain about him to the Better Business Bureau, we may demand legislation that would protect us from the abuses and annoyances of the business charlatan, but at the same time we create an American counterpart of nobility in the bosses of those salesmen, the executives who have devised all the questionable methods. Our press treats them as celebrities, our presidents invite them to serve on their Cabinets, our politicians court them as their patrons, and our ablest generals and admirals join their ranks upon retirement. It would be interesting to find out if any executives of profiteering drug firms were excluded from their social clubs after the recent public uproar. It would be interesting to find out how many "censured" advertising and network executives were boycotted socially after the TV scandals. Indeed, they still have a better chance of being invited to join President Eisenhower on the golf course or in a bridge game than any ordinary mortal victimized by these unscrupulous entrepreneurs.

Unfortunately, this psychology will outlive the current campaign against corruption, turning the campaign itself into a convenient alibi behind which corruption will continue to flourish.

President Eisenhower himself stands as a chief instance of such ethical pragmatism by expressing shock and dismay at payola practices only a short time after he defended the record of his closest aide, Sherman Adams, who was guilty of accepting payola. Such a conception allowed him to express dismay and at the same time use public funds to send his son and daughter-in-law around the world as members of his "official family". This kind of hypocrisy allows him to use public transportation for his frequent personal vacations, as if his golf games were played not by him but by the nation. Similarly, one must wonder whether the Gettysburg farm would prosper so well were it completely divorced from the high public office of its proprietor. We single out Mr. Eisenhower only because he epitomizes a generally accepted practice among our top national leaders.

When foreign dignitaries visit this country unaccompanied by their wives, children, perhaps even baby sitters, we are prone to dismiss the practice as evidence of their inferior humaneness. The contrasting American practice of a public leader involving his relations in the performance of his duties is a classical instance of corruption. So far reaching has this chiseling become that a new profession has resulted: the unique vocation of "former President of the United States". Little of that peculiar "profession" is reflected in the federal budget, but, nevertheless, a situation has been created in which the unofficial, private income of a former president is derived from his having been a president. Having reached the summit of public office, he is willing to share his acquired experience with the nation, provided it pays several thousand dollars for each of his public addresses.

One of the most corrupt practices in this nation relates to the fees paid to our "idealistic" leaders for providing public advice. A political leader, alleged to be motivated by nothing but the welfare of the nation and certain ethical values, offers or withholds his advice depending on the amount of money offered in return. Among those who share in this reprehensible practice, which reveals like nothing else the insincerity of the speaker, are some very wealthy individuals to whom several thousand dollars are of no consequence whatever. Such public figures believe they prove their "idealism" by donating their oration fees to charity. In reality they are no less hypocritical than the speaker who uses his fee for personal purposes. Donating to charity is not necessarily a completely one-sided, altruistic act; it bears rich rewards to the donor in personal satisfaction as well as public acclaim and gratitude. Anyone who accepts a fee for performing

(Continued on page 6)

How Clean is "Clean"?

(Continued from page 5)

a service to society cannot claim not to have been paid just because he parted with the fee for one purpose or another; his personal account was enlarged by the amount in question, and any way he disposes of it becomes an unrelated personal expenditure.

Also, this manifestation of corruption—paid-for "idealism"—is only a part of a still more pervasive scheme in which the very servicing of society becomes just another occupation or business. Our public leaders are anything but true public leaders moved by nothing but a desire to improve society. Their conception of their work is strictly professional. It is their way of making a living and reaping certain other rewards, such as social status, fame, etc. They are no different from any other businessman or professional. This in itself is quite a climax of corruption. The purpose of attending to public affairs is intrinsic, but our leaders have nothing to do with that purpose. They usurp a forum that exists solely to promote public welfare and subordinate it to the needs of their personal aspirations.

There exists a still broader, all-embracing scheme that includes media of culture whose first devotion and loyalty are not to culture but to profit making, media of entertainment that serve not entertainment but profit making, media of sports that promote not sports but profit making.

When the press of this nation is controlled by a homogeneous industry, can we expect its opinions and preconditioning of the public to serve solely the public welfare and not the specific interests of the big industry the press itself constitutes? When, for instance, labor legislation is being discussed and the publisher's interests versus hundreds or thousands of his employees are at stake, can we expect abstract idealism rather than sel-

fish interests to influence his judgment?

What characterizes our public life as unique when compared with that of any other country is a lack of genuineness. Neither our politics nor our culture, neither our entertainment nor our sports, neither our legislation nor our law enforcement are self-serving. They are all subordinated to the all-determining criterion of profitability. It is this predominance of the profit aspect which so often makes our public life seem synthetically composed. We do not even laugh when our sense of humor is stimulated but only when a profit motive arranged for us to laugh. We become addicted to one sport or another, to one kind of television entertainment or another not in a spontaneous manner but as ciphers whose reactions have been planned and provoked on the drawing boards of some business enterprise.

If, in obvious defiance of truth, we are told that a BBC-like radio and television network would be inconsistent with the public interest, and that the public interest requires our airwaves to be merchandised for business profits, how can we believe that the building of war planes, missiles, and submarines is not similarly motivated?

If the manufacturers of records were strong enough to make American musical tastes appear not what they genuinely are but what was expedient for them, what assurance is there that our weapon manufacturers, from whose ranks so many of our Cabinet members are recruited, are not influential enough to make our international interests appear not what they really are but what is expedient for them? If the Federal Communications Commission has failed to exercise its legal authority to police the sinful domain of radio and television, and its commissioners, as was proved, have been accepting payola from the industry, how can one

THE ORIGINAL SIN

The Renegation of

The circumstances under which the United States intervened in World War I closely resemble those under which she joined the fighting in World War II. On both occasions overwhelming public sentiment opposed any entanglement. On both occasions dramatic events occurred which enabled the respective administrations to seize the initiative and overcome the strong neutralist tendencies. And finally, both administrations were accused of staging, encouraging or provoking the drastic events that provided a pretext for intervention.

With all these similarities, a comparison of the isolationist movement preceding and accompanying World War I with the one preceding and accompanying World War II reveals a basic transformation. While the former was supported by democratic, liberal and leftist circles, the latter (with the exception of the period between the signing of the Nazi-Soviet pact and Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union, when the Communists opposed intervention) was sponsored by rightist and pro-Nazi elements. Only with the outbreak of World War II did isolationism become identified with reactionary elements.

MOTIVATION IN 1917

How different this had been in World War I is well illustrated in the words of the Wilson Administration's propaganda chief: "Before we got into (the war) . . . our entrance had its chief impulsion from our most reactionary and least democratic elements. Consequently, nearly all our most progressive and liberal leaders had marked themselves as opposed to it."¹ The Socialist leader Victor Berger expressed this more pointedly: "If democracy were the object of the war, it would have a different set of enthusiasts."²

The motivation of the opponents of war in 1917 was quite different from that of their political successors in 1939-1941. The very elements which in 1917 warned against intentions of economic self-aggrandizement, supported intervention in 1939-1941. On April 4, 1917, during the congressional debate on the war resolution, Senator George W. Norris bluntly accused the United States of "going into war upon the command of gold" and then dramatically exclaimed, "I would like to say to this war god, you shall not coin into gold the lifeblood of my brethren." He then bitingly remarked, "I feel we are about to put the dollar sign upon the American flag."³

In the same debate Senator Robert M. La Follette ridiculed the alleged ideological motivation invoked by the interventionists, pointing out that England, on whose side the U. S. would be fighting, was hardly promoting democracy in Ireland, Egypt, or India. He squarely placed the responsibility for the deterioration of relations with Germany on the American Government, arguing that "from early in the war, (we) threw our neutrality to the winds by permitting England to make a mockery of it to her advantage against her chief enemy. Then we expect to say to that enemy, 'You have got to respect my rights as a neutral.' What is the answer? I say Germany has been patient with us."⁴

On April 7, 1917, one day after war was declared, an emergency meeting of Socialist leaders in St. Louis adopted, among others, a resolution which said: "Our entrance into the European war was instigated by the predatory capitalists in the United States who boast of the enormous profit of \$7,000,000,000 from the manufacture and sale of munitions

¹The War, the World, and Wilson by George Creel, New York, 1920, p. 145.

The quotes with footnotes 1-6 and 8 were taken from *Opponents of War, 1917-1918* by H. C. Peterson and Gilbert C. Fite, The University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1957.

²Milwaukee Leader, August 13, 1917.

³Congressional Record, 65 Cong., 1 Session, April 4, 1917, pp. 212, 214.

⁴Ibid., p. 234.

⁵American Socialist, April 21, 1917.

⁶Congressional Record, April 4, 1917, p. 209.

⁷The Final Secret of Pearl Harbor, The Devin-Adair Co., New York, 1954, p. 3.

"Corrupt influence, which is itself the perennial spring of all prodigality, and of all disorder; which loads us, more than millions of debt; which takes away vigour from our arms, wisdom from our councils, and every shadow of authority and credit from the most venerable parts of our constitution."

—Edmund Burke

n of Isolationism

and war supplies and from exportation of American foodstuffs, and other necessities. They are also deeply interested in the continuance of war and the success of the allied arms through their huge loans to the Governments of the allied powers . . .

Ruthless as the unrestricted submarine war policy of the German Government was and is, it is not an invasion of the rights of American people as such, but only an interference with the opportunity of certain groups of American capitalists to coin cold profits out of the blood and sufferings of our fellow men in the warring countries of Europe."⁶

MOTIVATION IN 1939-1941

While American intervention in 1941 was not without intentions of economic self-aggrandizement, these were, unlike in 1917, not the sole intentions. World War II provided an occasion to destroy the crucially competitive industries of Europe and Japan. Hitler's occupation of most of Europe justified the bombing not only of German factories but also those of friendly nations conquered by his forces. It is conceivable that American intervention was delayed in part out of a desire to precipitate such a situation. Had the Nazi forces been prevented from occupying France, Czechoslovakia and other industrially developed European countries, the patriots of those countries need not have applied for American bombardment of their industrial centers. By allowing enough time for the German forces to spread over Europe a situation was created in which the industries of both hostile and friendly nations could be cancelled out of post-war competition. Whether this was actually a calculated scheme or an incidental result, the fact remains that the American share of the world's total income grew from 25 per cent prior to World War II to 40 per cent after the war.

While the interventionists of 1939-1941 included certain circles which were pursuing nothing but economic self-aggrandizement, the chief impulsion came from elements who were moved by completely different reasons. Their motivation was moral and political—it stemmed from an identification with those progressive European forces which were threatened by Hitler.

THE UNPOPULARITY OF INTERVENTION

American intervention was as unpopular in 1939-1941 as it was in 1917. On both occasions the isolationists demanded a popular referendum before a declaration of war could take effect. On April 4, 1917 Senator James K. Vardaman challenged President Wilson in these words: "The President . . . suggested that if the people who are now engaged in this war in Europe had been consulted there would have been no war. If I may be permitted to indulge in a little speculation I will say, Mr. President, that if the people of the United States—I mean the plain, honest people, the masses who are to bear the burden of taxation and fight the Nation's battles, were consulted—the United States would not make a declaration of war against Germany to-day . . . If it is wrong for a king to plunge his subjects into the vortex of war without their consent, it cannot be less reprehensible for the President of the United States and the Congress to involve their constituents in a war without their consent."⁶ Even the interventionists did not challenge the isolationists' evaluation of the popular sentiment.

In 1939-1941 opposition to war was not less popular. Indeed, this evaluation of public opinion has never been challenged and has been conclusively documented. Typical is the contention of Rear-Admiral Robert A. Theobald: "As the people of this country were so strongly opposed to war, one of the Axis powers must be forced to involve the United States, and in such a way as to arouse the American people to whole-hearted belief in the necessity of fighting. This would require drastic action, and the decision was unquestionably a difficult one for the President to make."⁷

(Continued on page 12)

hope that other branches of industry will fail to establish national policies regarding armaments, nuclear ban or international trade in accordance with their own profit interests? And can we be so blind as to believe that the crisis in our educational system is being evaluated in terms of the public welfare rather than the stock market?

Under the circumstances who knows how genuine the cold war is? Is it really an unavoidable clash of international interests, or is it a phase of an intentionally and expediently distorted and slanted picture?

So pervasive has the payola practice become in the field of legislation that there are no inhibitions left in referring to official lobbies. Who can doubt the effectiveness of lobbying, on which organized interests find it expedient to spend many millions of dollars? And where is the authority to investigate the link between the uninhibited lobbies and the nation's legislature? How much of our legislation is being bought, and how much needed legislation is being prevented through payola? Our ethical sensitivity in this respect has been so calloused, that

when a candidate for public office, including the highest one the nation has to offer, uses campaign payola to finance his election campaign rather than to pay for personal expenditures, we hardly find anything objectionable in the practice. Indeed, we take for granted that unofficially he is bound to be the representative of one business lobby or another.

The predominance of profitableness in our life makes our society resemble a huge cartel more than a nation, our sense of values—a business doctrine more than a philosophy of national life, and our national sense of destiny—a pragmatic business expedient more than a spiritual bridge between generations past and generations to come.

A bit of legislation here and there can correct one detail or another but the results would be insignificant in proportion to the basic, fundamental falsehoods that would still prevail in our lives. To tackle them much more radical reforms are needed: they must be radical enough to change the entire philosophy of our public life, and there must be a re-defining of the very goals for which our society is organized.



"Sam, I just don't like that new kid hanging around the neighborhood!"

SYMPOSIUM on: Which Road to Lasting Peace?

"They shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more."

—Isaiah

First Step: Atlantic Union

By JUSTIN BLACKWELDER

The idea of world disarmament is gaining very rapid acceptance in this country and elsewhere. In recent years, various plans have been put forward. The most notable is World Peace Through World Law, by Grenville Clark and Louis B. Sohn. Tom Slick's book, Permanent Peace, has borrowed extensively from Clark and Sohn's work. So have the new American Bar Association studies, headed by Charles Rhyne, and financed by a Government grant.

These proposals are stated in different ways, but the differences seem rather of degree than of substance. Fundamental to them all is the idea that while little can be done about the causes of international conflicts, we can at least put an end to international war. This is to be done by taking away from the individual nations the power to wage war. Two corollaries to this principle are international inspection and international enforcement. The power to inspect and to enforce is to be given to a "revised" United Nations.

If these are sound proposals and can accomplish what is claimed for them, most of us would want to support them. If they are unsound, they are nonetheless important.

At the Cleveland meeting of the Conference on World Order sponsored by the National Council of Churches about a year and a half ago, the delegates by a very heavy margin, voted in favor of world disarmament and unquestioning acceptance of the United Nations as the agency through which to obtain it. Having in substance given this sweeping vote of confidence in world government (for their resolution could not mean anything else), they made it clear that they were opposed to world government.

How this inconsistent development came about is obvious. One of the first resolutions passed stated that the essential first step is disarmament. This was an error of such monumental proportions that it made the subsequent errors easy.

Disarmament is not a first step; it is a last step. The first step is government. The delegates might just as well have assembled on a field on a rainy day and voted to erect a wooden shelter, starting with the roof as the most essential part.

A prominent attorney delivered a speech before the Bar Association in which he pointed out that the development of the Western United States showed clearly that you did not get peace until you had established law. Who should know better than an attorney that laws have no effect in the absence of an authority to enforce them? The West was wild, not because there were no laws, but because laws were enforced inadequately or not at all. Hand in hand with laws must go a general acceptance of them (a lesson taught by the 18th Amendment), courts to interpret them and agencies to enforce them. These are produced only by a government.

There are only two ways of organizing groups of sovereign nations in times of peace: alliances of nations, which do not work, and unions of citizens, which do.

The United Nations, like the League of Nations which preceded it, is an alliance of sovereign nations. It does not protect society from major aggression, it cannot do so and,

so long as it remains an alliance of sovereign nations, it never will.

It has not been possible to strengthen the Charter to make it even as good as some alliances have been in times past. It is not, for instance, nearly the equal of the American colonies' League of Friendship, under the Articles of Confederation, which preceded the Constitution of the United States. Relatively strong as the League of Friendship was, still it was wholly inadequate, and had to be replaced with a federal government.

The United Nations is not a government. It does not even resemble a government. It is a peace-time alliance of sovereign nations, all of whom have maintained their sovereign rights. It seems hardly necessary to point out that disarmament based on treaties with nations that flagrantly violate treaties would be foolhardy indeed.

Genuine universal disarmament could only follow the creation of a body of world law (which presupposes a world legislature), a world court, and a world police force, which could only be the product of a world government.

Those who insist that the problems of international disarmament must be attacked on a world-wide basis should face up to the unpleasant fact that world government thereby becomes their first objective, not their last. If they would do this, they would soon see that the problem cannot be attacked on a world-wide basis at the present time because a world-wide government acceptable to the various inhabitants of the earth is not now possible. A democratic world government is plainly unobtainable in the near future.

Whether we like it or not, we cannot have democratic world government now; but it is equally true that we cannot continue in our own separate, sovereign, national ways lest we head for disaster. The fact that we cannot do all the things that we might wish is no excuse for sitting on our hands. A start can be made toward world order, even though it cannot yet be made on a world-wide scale. What is required is that we get our heads out of the clouds and start to do now the things that can be done now.

The brilliant British economist, Barbara Ward, has stated this case well: "If a world order is to be anything but totalitarian, then the Western nations must at least create a nucleus of free cooperation, and if they cannot begin in an Atlantic Community, then certainly there is no other starting place available to them. An Atlantic Union may fall short of that unity which technically, scientifically, and economically the modern world requires. It falls short of the international hopes nourished in the West's liberal tradition. It falls short of that brotherhood of all humanity which the great religions have planted as a dream in the human heart. But at least it is a beginning, and if men can learn, within a Western community based on common political and social ideals, to tame their arrogant nationalism and to abate their economic pretensions, they will at least have undergone the best possible preparation for a world society, against the day when it is possible to build one and to build it free."

If the Western democracies wish to survive, this is the road they must ultimately take.

JUSTIN BLACKWELDER is the Executive Secretary of the Atlantic Union Committee.

Peace Through U.N. Reform*

By MARY HAYS WEIK

It is almost 15 years since the second World War ended, and out of its ruins and desperation a great resolve arose to build a peace that would end such wars forever. How far have we come today on the road to such a peace? We have allowed the world to be divided squarely in two, on a basis of economic philosophies. And peace itself has been caught in this division. A tragic amount of time has been wasted trying to devise plans for a world government that would somehow give advantage to one side (our own), and yet be acceptable to the other side too. Common-sense should tell us that no plan could possibly do both. Under the conditions of distrust that today exist throughout the world, no plan, however clever, has a ghost of a chance except one that offers exactly the same rights and opportunities to all.

What is the United Nations today, to which we look so hopefully for answers to the world's most desperate problems?—A group of appointed delegates from 82 of the world's nations. Yet we know that there are in the world today more than 125 countries, large and small, rated as autonomous or self-governing. This means that more than 40 of these now stand unrepresented in the United Nations, not to mention all the colonies, protectorates, and trusteeships, inhabited by more than a hundred million people, that have no voice of their own in the UN Assembly today:

* For a fuller account of election procedures, national delegations, etc., see author's study, *A PARLIAMENT FOR MAN* (American Federation of World Citizens, 262 Albion Place, Cincinnati 19, Ohio—50¢).

MARY HAYS WEIK is the Director and Editor of the American Federation of World Citizens and an accredited observer at the United Nations.

WORLD REPRESENTATION TODAY

	Habitable Area (Sq. Miles)	Population	% of Population
World Totals:	52,259,407	2,790,000,000	100%
UN Represents:	36,887,228	1,856,702,077	66%

Unrepresented Today: 15,372,179 933,297,923 33%
of the world's population

Yet, even in the United Nations, who represents the people of all its member countries: who speaks for their rights, protects their resources, their freedoms, their economic development? No one. Not one of the delegates at the UN today, however worthy he may be, actually represents or speaks for his country's people—for the people themselves have had no hand in his choosing.

How can this situation be reformed? How can today's unjust and inadequate representation be changed, so that the vote of tiny Iceland, with only 166,000 citizens, will no longer equal, as today, that of the whole subcontinent of India, with nearly 400 million people? How can the present UN General Assembly, with power only to debate and recommend, be developed into a functioning world legislature, able to enact and enforce enlightened world law? How can this world Assembly wield such far-reaching powers, and yet be subject to the collective control of all its member states, without individual advantage or favoritism?

The first essential step, I believe, is to replace today's appointed UN delegates with a truly representative federal body—a balanced Assembly of two chambers, as has been found practical in so many of the world's existing national legislatures, including our own Congress: representing all

(Continued on page 10)

Effect More Important Than Intent

By M. S. ARNONI

The fateful dilemma, how to preserve peace, bears in our generation the threat of death and promise of survival for every human being. Any sincere effort intended to avert a holocaust, whether one agrees with or dissents from it, deserves one's deepest respect. It is in this spirit that the following polemic is offered.

The two other authors who contributed thoughtfully to this symposium agree on quite a few recommendations but differ on others. The ultimate goal of both—and we enthusiastically concur—is to preserve world peace. But, as Mr. Blackwelder correctly remarks, "if (proposals for the achievement of this) are unsound, they are nonetheless important". At times their importance is strictly, even dangerously, negative, because they could create deceptive illusions for many people who would otherwise support more effective alternatives.

Mr. Blackwelder's arguments against "alliance(s) of sovereign nations" and in favor of "a body of world law (which presupposes a world legislature), a world court, and a world police force" are as convincing as they could be. Unfortunately, he not only fails to show a way to achieve his plan, which we presume expresses the ideas of the Atlantic Union Committee, but, in effect, he even frustrates his basic purpose: not only do we not wind up with "a body of world law" but indeed his "utopia" presents a world even more hopelessly divided than now. On the one hand, we find the consolidated forces of the Atlantic Alliance and on the other, the camp of those who would regard the advocated unity as unacceptable, that is the Communists.

These ideas are put forward as "a start . . . toward world order, even though it cannot yet be made on a world-wide scale". The obvious question arises, what would be the second stage towards a world order? How does Mr. Blackwelder propose to eventually reconcile his Atlantic Union with those nations still outside of it? Surely the Atlantic

Union Committee has ideas on this, and, since it is pledged to world order eventually, why not put them forward now? If the Committee lacks such ideas, how can it claim that its initial recommendations would eventually lead to a world order? By what means could the Atlantic Union be converted to a world order?

The fact that neutral as well as communist countries are left off the restricted map Mr. Blackwelder chooses to call the world adds to the extremely uncomfortable feeling that his theory could be unscrupulously seized upon by the most militant opponents of the Soviet Union and China. They could, through skillful propaganda, exploit men's innocent desire for world order to create a more consolidated and total opposition to the international competitors of the present Atlantic Alliance. This would serve the very opposite of what men everywhere wish: instead of an international accommodation and a peaceful world, one camp would consolidate itself for the wiping out of the other camp. One cannot help being apprehensive about a scheme for world order that could in all probability be enthusiastically endorsed by such a "cosmopolite" as General Lauris Norstad.

With all the respect we entertain for Mr. Blackwelder's intentions, his strategy fails even to suggest a possibility for achieving his principal goal. And, perhaps unwittingly, it has created a vehicle for plunging the world into the very disaster it sets out to avert.

There seems to be a similar unrelatedness between purpose and strategy in Mrs. Weik's splendid advocacy of a democratic reform of the United Nations. The main difference between Mr. Blackwelder and Mrs. Weik seems to be dramatized in the latter's wise warning that "no plan, however clever, has a ghost of a chance except one that offers exactly

(Continued on page 10)

Peace Through U. N. Reform

(Continued from page 9)

the world's people, in just and accurate proportion to their populations; chosen by their countries' people for their character and statesmanship; directly elected by their people, in the most democratic way possible in every country.

BEGIN WITH MAN

Let us start with the realization that every adult citizen of the world of normal intelligence is equipped by nature, when properly informed, to take a part in world decisions. Man for man, and woman for woman, educated or illiterate, they are entitled to full representation in any enlightened world government that hopes to last. For unless the new United Nations we plan allows a voice for every one of its citizens at the very start, it will remain a theory of limited support, and fall at the first breeze of discontent.

This is where our generation must begin to see with new eyes. We must view the world as the potential whole it is; begin to think in terms of the people themselves, the whole people, not just of the governments they live under or the nations they happen to inhabit, or the culture or lack of culture they may have inherited. For history has proved, time and again, that moral judgment is as apt to be found in the unschooled as in the university-trained. The yardstick of a people's intelligence is not their literacy or illiteracy. Has the literacy of the so-called civilized nations today prevented a wholly irresponsible use of their science for wholesale destruction?

Securing a responsible world electorate depends on a different factor—the development of adequate technical means, conscientiously employed, through films, recordings, radio and television, to get an honest picture of important world issues into every new voter's hands, whether he can read or not—giving him the facts he needs, reduced to clear and accurate terms, on which to base his own decisions.

SELF-GOVERNMENT FOR THE WORLD

The plan I offer for reformed UN representation is a simple one. It is based on plain numerical facts, which any man or woman, literate or illiterate, can grasp and understand: the actual number of people in every country of the world. For in no other way can every citizen of the world, of every color, creed, or income, on even the smallest island of the Pacific, be given a direct and equal voice in the management of his world's affairs, an effective hand in keeping his world at peace.

The new United Nations Assembly I propose would be a bicameral one, a

balanced legislature of two chambers, directly elected by the people—in one of which, the Chamber of Nations, all the independent and self-governing states, large and small, would sit in equal dignity; the other, the Chamber of Peoples, to contain the representatives of all the peoples of the world, self-governing or dependent, allotted according to their actual populations, at the ratio of one delegate, with one vote, to every 5 million people. Here we come face to face with the main concern of those who worry about the undue influence some of the more populous countries might have in such a Chamber of Peoples—such as mainland China, whose population of nearly 600 millions would enable her, under this system, to seat 119 delegates in this house, more than three times the United States' quota of 35.

Would this upset the new Assembly's balance of votes? Many Americans believe it would, and frankly fear the results of such a difference in delegate numbers. I believe their fears are based on a simple misunderstanding. Is the state of New York, with 43 times the representation of either Vermont, Delaware, Nevada, or Wyoming, a menace to the smaller states? Of course not; because any inequality of numbers between the states in the House is counterbalanced by the Senate's equal representation for all.

The situation in a bicameral UN Assembly, one of whose houses, the Chamber of Peoples, was elected on a straight population basis, would be precisely the same. The Chamber of Nations would give equal federal representation to all the world's self-governing states; the Chamber of Peoples would represent accurately all the world's citizens. And the two together would maintain the same freely functioning balance that our US Congress now maintains, safeguarded from dan-

Effect More Important Than Intent (Continued from page 9)

the same rights and opportunities to all." Mr. Blackwelder's theory is pessimistic, Mrs. Weik's theory is over-optimistic. In her approach there is an almost mystical reliance on the magic of democratic representation.

Mrs. Weik's plan, which sets out to establish a world government "to build a peace that would end . . . wars forever", finally falls short of that purpose and instead achieves full representation of the world's population in the United Nations. The author takes for granted that such democratic representation would "end wars forever", merely assuming a cause-and-effect relationship that does not necessarily exist.

Accepting for the moment Mrs. Weik's rather naive confidence in political democracy, I fail to see how political democracy by itself can solve "the world's most desperate problems". Indeed, the truly desperate problems of mankind take precedence over the need

ger of domination by countries large or small.

It is the latter fact that looms largest in the thinking of the new nations now emerging from colonialism. Many of these are among the world's most populous—India with nearly 400 millions, Pakistan with 85 millions, Indonesia with 86 millions. Even the world's largest, mainland China with almost 600 millions, possesses the same memories of recent exploitation, the same suspicion and fear of Western domination and paternalism. Nothing but an offer of scrupulously fair numerical representation in one house of a world legislature, together with equal federal status in another, will ever satisfy any of these new countries. Yet without their positive participation, how can any effective worldwide government ever come into being?

Will it be easy to set up these new world institutions we need? Only a determined cooperative effort by citizens of intelligence all over the world, working together for their common safety, can ever achieve it. Yet it must be done, and soon, if we and our children wish to survive. For history is giving us one last chance, in a world where national boundaries can no longer provide security. Today in America, as in every country of the globe, we live on a shrinking island, lapped by the shifting, perilous tides of a world without enforceable justice or law—where weapons of total extermination multiply day by day, with little or no effective means of control. Shall we wait for the tides to rise and engulf us all? Or shall we behave like reasonable human beings; and start now to lay the first foundations for a world of peace and plenty, by strengthening the United Nations into a just world federal government, offering all mankind a share in its responsibilities and rewards?

to spread political democracy: it is infinitely more important to feed the hungry of this earth than to condition them to political campaigning; it is more vital to erase diseases than to insure the voting rights of the diseased. In a very real sense I believe that men like Prime Minister Nkrumah of Ghana and Sukarno of Indonesia, who are by no means democratic pedants, serve democracy more effectively than would the illiterates Mrs. Weik is striving to involve in politics.

This holds true not only in regard to underdeveloped countries; it applies to the United States and other Western nations as well. Ascribing a kind of magic to the American popular vote, Mrs. Weik believes all crucial problems of the world curable by it. One cannot help but ask, where is the paradise created by the popular vote in America?

So unsuspecting is Mrs. Weik's dedi-

THE WAY WE SEE IT

GHOST WRITING CREATES GHOSTS

If New York District Attorney Frank S. Hogan decides to prosecute ghost writing agencies for selling theses to college students (and certainly, he should!), the number of those who should join the accused is so large that even Yankee Stadium could not accommodate them all.

If it is a crime to pay \$3,000 for a doctorate dissertation (and it certainly is!), isn't it at least an equal crime to become the President of the United States or a Senator by reading off to the electorate speeches the candidate himself is not capable of writing?

It is one thing for a public personality to use the secretarial services of his staff but it is an entirely different thing to appear wiser, more learned, and more articulate by buying someone else's brain. One may perhaps be tolerant of the coaching provided by Robert Montgomery in preparation for presidential TV appearances, but intellectual imposture is equally reprehensible when resorted to by political leaders as when it results in the publication of a book by a notorious but illiterate criminal.

That, "thanks" to the ghost writing agencies, a few more half-educated individuals can add a Ph.D. to their names is by no means as serious as gaining public trust through similar imposture.

cation to political democracy that she not only advocates the use of propagandistic oversimplifications, but fails to appreciate the fallacies in the relationship between the "democratic" citizen and the "democratic" leader, and, to top it all, conceives of education as an utterly unnecessary luxury for political wisdom. Prophetically she asks and accuses: "Has the literacy of the so-called civilized nations today prevented a wholly irresponsible use of their science for wholesale destruction?"

In these words lie a dangerous interpretation of and reaction to the history of our generation. For whatever man has achieved thus far—and in spite of all let us not underestimate human progress!—has been the result of education. Wars, deprivation, and exploitation cannot be laid to the ineffectiveness of education but rather to its scarcity. One should not confuse elementary literacy, or the capacity to consume official propaganda, with real education which unshackles man's mind and makes him assert his human dignity and intellectual integrity. We should not blame education for man's tragedies but rather blame the substitution of mind-restricting indoctrination for it.

In spite of this criticism, I believe Mrs. Weik's theory to be most constructive in that it delegates great

THE "RELIGIOUS" TRAP

Senator John F. Kennedy seems to be coming pretty close to posing to the voter essentially this dilemma: "Either you are a bigot, or you vote for me!"

Among all the objections we entertain against Senator Kennedy's presidential candidacy there is no religious one. Not that we are joining the ridiculous fallacy of our society that permits no word of criticism against the Catholic Church lest one be branded a bigot, but we do not tend to take the Senator's denominational devotion too literally.

The history of the Catholic Church and its intrinsic anti-democratic philosophy are such that throughout the world, Catholic countries and progressive elements not excluded, it has become a symbol of reaction. Yet, in America, the demand for utilitarian "religiosity", as a Vincent Peal type of mental hygiene or as a politically conserving influence, is so universal that even a Catholic would be gambling his public acclaim were he openly to admit his denominational qualms.

It is ironically humorous that Sen. Kennedy could not afford to appease those who object to his candidacy on religious grounds by admitting his own reservations, if he has any. In this hypocritical relation to his church he is by no means an exception. Rather, he joins the tens of millions of church-attending Americans of all de-

nominations who, deprived of all theological inspiration, accept formal religious manifestations and professions as a convenience and a social must.

☞

10 — 1 = 10

The following is an excerpt from Mr. Drew Pearson's recent column, here reprinted with his permission.

Hagerty's denials that Sherman Adams had ever intervened with Government agencies on behalf of Bernard Goldfine, that he had done anything improper, that Adams would resign, or that Adams had received any "rugs" from Goldfine, took place at a time when Jim was hurling a lot of denials in the direction of this writer.

Shortly after these denials, Peter Kumpa of the Baltimore Sun asked Hagerty:

"Jim, back on June 17 you gave a list of 10 falsehoods that you said Mr. Drew Pearson made in one of his columns. One of these 10 falsehoods said that Bernard Goldfine had paid for two suits bought at Faber's of Boston for Governor Adams. Yet on the stand Mr. Goldfine testified that he had paid for the suits and further, deducted these as a business expense. I just wonder what you had to say about that."

Hagerty: "Nothing."

Kumpa: "Does that make nine falsehoods?"

Hagerty: "No—I have nothing."

problems of world scope to relations between individuals and between the individual and society. Any search for solutions for world-wide problems must adopt such an approach.

Unfortunately, I do not find easy, "simple" formulae to solve problems mankind has been unable to solve throughout recorded history. There seems to exist an even greater problem than that of making the United Nations democratic. Even if we should successfully eliminate archaic and anachronistic national boundaries, man would still find new means for exploiting his fellow man and one society, whatever its structure, would still exploit another. In this respect political democracy has proved absolutely ineffective. The equality it establishes is illusory and one sided; what kind of equality permits one man to drive up to the ballot booth in a chauffeured Cadillac while another man casts his vote the day before he dies of an illness he had no money to cure?

The problems mankind faces are so complex and obscured that even a clear definition of them is impossible. While we may never remain aloof from them nor resign ourselves to a feeling of helplessness, we must be realistic enough to realize that they cannot be solved, or even defined, within a few years or even a few decades.

But there is one problem so crucial

that its solution may not wait until the whole complex of man's and society's inadequacies is defined and coped with, that is, HOW TO PRESERVE PEACE. While it is doubtless a part of more complex anomalies, this problem must be faced and dealt with now because a war of annihilation could break out today or any time thereafter. Mr. Blackwelder correctly points out that lasting disarmament must be based on world law, but when you witness two antagonists drawing weapons against each other you don't stop to query them about their mutual grievances; first, if you possibly can, you knock the guns out of their hands. If there existed a world power stronger and more scrupulous than the United States and the Soviet Union, that power could force both to lay down their frightening arms and cool off. In the absence of such sane omnipotence, the task falls to the small man, the anonymous citizen. Wherever he lives on this earth, whatever his station in life, he must convince his government that it cannot rely on his blind obedience, that his loyalty to himself and to mankind is greater than his loyalty to the oligarchy that is willing to sacrifice his life for its own factional benefits. If he, the gray Mr. Citizen, fails us, and all our hopes have to be pinned on governments, there will be little hope left for mankind.

THE BRIGHTER SIDE

Three Cheers

► **FOR the President's Committee on Government Contracts** for launching an effort to end racial discrimination on federal construction projects.

► **FOR Senator Hubert H. Humphrey's** suggestion of a "*Manhattan Project for Peace*" to break through the disarmament stalemate and provide the basis for a secure peace.

► **FOR the House Armed Services Committee** for preparing a bill to curb influence peddling by retired military officers.

► **FOR the Supreme Court's** upholding of the major section of the 1957 Civil Rights Act, which empowers the Justice Department to protect Negro voting rights against state action.

► **FOR the Supreme Court's** ruling that Little Rock had no right to compel disclosure of membership lists of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People under the guise of checking its tax status.

► **FOR the U. S. Navy's** revoking of a proviso permitting the Navy to cancel the charter of a ship barred from Arab ports because it had traded with Israel, and which in effect amounted to supporting the Arab boycott.

► **FOR the Special Committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York** for preparing for Congress a study of the conflict-of-interests problems together with a bill designed to bring about suggested reforms.

► **FOR the Supreme Court's** restoring of voting rights to nearly 90 per cent of Negro voters in Louisiana which had been challenged by the White Citizens Council.

► **FOR the National Conference on Higher Education** for taking a stand against the loyalty oath and the disclaimer affidavit required by the National Defense Education Act.

► **FOR the determined opposition in the House of Representatives** to a bill which would provide tax relief for American firms operating overseas.

► **FOR the U. S. Court of Appeals** for reversing two convictions for narcotics violations because police gathered the evidence through an illegal search.

► **FOR the thousands of Negro students and teachers** throughout the South who have been participating in peaceful demonstrations against racial discrimination.

The Renegation of Isolationism (Continued from page 7)

But, in either case, popular sentiment was not allowed to prevail.

THE PRESIDENTIAL SCHEMES

Both President Wilson and President Roosevelt have been accused of strikingly similar schemes to change public sentiment and create an atmosphere in which a declaration of war would seem not only necessary but indeed inevitable.

When the sinking of the *Lusitania* was exploited as a pretext for declaring war on Germany in 1917, few people bore in mind that the tragic incident occurred almost two years earlier. The very mention of the date of the sinking was regarded as unpatriotic in that it tended to weaken the alleged cause-and-effect relation between the incident and the declaration of war. But even the circumstances under which the sinking occurred presented a

two-sided picture. In a speech before a convention of the Nonpartisan League in St. Paul on September 20, 1917 Senator La Follette revealed that "*Four days before the Lusitania sailed President Wilson was warned in person by Secretary of State Bryan that the Lusitania had 6,000,000 rounds of ammunition on board, besides explosives; and that the passengers who proposed to sail on that vessel were sailing in violation of a statute of this country; that no passenger shall sail or travel upon a railroad train or upon a vessel which carries dangerous explosives . . .*"⁸

This accusation closely resembles the one later made against President Roosevelt in connection with the Pearl Harbor disaster. He was accused of intentionally seeing to it that "*a great number of vitally important messages which disclosed Japanese intentions were never supplied to the Commanders in Pearl Harbor.*"⁹ Only history will be able to provide a conclusive evaluation of these accusations. One thing is certain, however: neither Wilson nor Roosevelt were inclined to leave the deci-

sion of waging war to a popular referendum.

THE RENEGATION

Whatever will be the verdict of history concerning the alleged schemes of the two presidents to plunge the country into war, there still remains to be explained why intervention in 1917 was "*reactionary*", and intervention in 1941—"progressive".

Until World War I the most significant landmarks of American foreign policy were the Monroe Doctrine and the policy of the Open Door with respect to the Far East. With American entrance into World War I, notice was served that from then on all continents were potentially spheres of American economic interest. The intervention came about exclusively for the sake of economic self-aggrandizement.

When our diplomats answer accusations of American colonialism by pointing out that American forces are usually withdrawn from the territories of the defeated enemy, they fail to convince their critics, and for good reasons: military occupation has historically ensured economic aggrandizement. If such aggrandizement is achieved without military occupation, exploitation is served nonetheless.

The history of Europe between the two world wars was not written by the Europeans themselves. American intervention not only determined the outcome of World War I; it also precluded Europe's ability to recover. In the aftermath of that war, Europe never regained conditions of normalcy, and this situation gave rise to Mussolini in Italy and Hitler in Germany. The way the first world war ended did not resolve any of the problems that had caused it in the first place. On the contrary, they became even more aggravated. The attempt to perpetuate these anomalies, which, at the time the Treaty of Versailles was signed, made many thoughtful individuals warn that the struggle was not over, invited a repetition of the catastrophe.

Without America's participation in the war, Europe would have presented quite a different picture. The colonial war booty of victorious Germany would have compromised nothing but British and French colonialism. The capacities of the German people would have been fully and constructively employed, while neither Prussian militarism nor Austro-Hungarian absolutism would have had much of a chance to survive. The educational and social development of the peoples of the Continent was absolutely inconsistent with the perpetuation of those political institutions. Conceivably, such a Europe would have reached the summit of its development, achieving a synthesis of its culture and the new international division of wealth.

When, in 1917, President Wilson decided to plunge the United States into war, he probably did not suspect that he was actually engaging his country in two world wars. His decision established American intercontinental economic interests. What happened on the European continent from then on directly involved significant American interests. America could no longer

⁸ *New York Times*, October 12, 1917.

⁹ Rear Adm. Husband E. Kimmel in a foreword to *The Final Truth of Pearl Harbor*.

What Is Standard of Living?

What would your reaction be if you wrote a letter to a friend or relative inquiring about his and his family's welfare, and in response got nothing but the stub of his weekly paycheck? Even if it disclosed a rather handsome income, it would probably make you apprehensive. First of all you would worry about whether the man still has his mental equilibrium; secondly, whether the couple is still living together; thirdly, whether all members of the family are still alive.

Yet America's repetitious boasts of the "highest standard of living" in the world amount to just that. Not that our statistical computations are unreliable, but there is little appreciation of the fact that steel production or car ownership are not the sole criteria of a nation's standard of living. Such statistical computations are made for strictly economic purposes and do not capture the full context of the individual's or the country's degree of self-fulfillment.

But even while limiting our consideration to the economic aspect, often the occupants of shacks mentally live on Fifth Avenue, believing it to be much more typical of America than they are.

One such major misconception is due to the fact that, when we compare American production and consumption with those of another country, we often in effect compare our two-day achievement with the other country's one-day achievement. In fact, much of American purchasing power does not reflect actual purchasing power at the time a purchase is made, but an advance on a hypothetical future purchase power. The man who buys a car on time does not have the purchase power to avail himself of the car. He is able to get it only because he pawned his FUTURE purchase power.

It would be fine if that man, in spite of pledging a part of his future purchase power, could still afford to live well. The trouble is that his signed-away purchase power often becomes disproportionate to his income. Broadening this instance to the proportions of the national economy, we should not lose sight of the fact that each period of prosperity heralds and actually creates a period of recession. A nation which prospers for several years eating up not only its current but also its future produce offers a deceptive picture indeed: the unavoidable setback is part and parcel of its economic standard, and it cannot make only its happy days count.

That American economic history is a chain of alternating waves of prosperity and crisis is all too obvious. I assume the working man who enjoys some of the blessings of prosperity but is the first victim of a recession would settle for something between the two in return for a more enduring and shockproof standard of living.

The one item we so often believe dramatizes our highest standard of living is the car. Yet, this "conclusive" proof ignores

the fact that private car ownership fulfills quite a different role in the U. S. A. than it does in other technically developed countries. In Europe, car ownership is a definite luxury, not so much because fewer people can afford it, but primarily because the availability of an extremely well developed public transportation system renders a private car much less necessary. In the U. S. A., people do not own cars because they are well-to-do, but because limited public transportation renders it an absolute must. The unemployed American is no better off than the unemployed European just because he drives his own car to collect the unemployment check; his European counter-part reaches the unemployment agency just as well.

This leads us to another Achilles heel in our concept of standards of living. While we believe it to be paramously affected by the availability of merchandise, we are prone to ignore the importance of public services just because in this respect we have not much to show. Good living depends very much on the services society provides for the individual. Beginning with postal efficiency and ending with such vital matters as job security (through the state's accepting responsibility for full employment), health services, public transportation etc.—such services determine the individual's and the family's welfare even more than a banking and financing system which allows them to consume the fruit of tomorrow's work today.

Comparing the national economies of the United States and certain other developed countries, additional allowances must be made in favor of the latter. There are countries, in Scandinavia for instance, where extreme poverty and deprivation are virtually unknown to any segment of society. If we could achieve a similar situation by eliminating, for example, the dishwasher from the American home, even though this would lower our statistical standard of living, we might be striking a wonderful bargain.

So far we have touched only on material aspects of standards of living. Like our inquiring friend mentioned above, we have also to look into other than material factors in a person's life. A man's total earnings hardly provide the story of his life. The books he reads, the concerts and plays he attends, the meaningfulness of his leisure, cannot always be captured in statistics but they always account for a richer or poorer life. I am afraid it would be no exaggeration to say that a very vast majority of our co-citizens go through life without attending a single symphonic concert or theatrical show, or reading a single worthwhile book. If we also consider these criteria as reflecting a standard of living, our boasts become laughable.

Those who think of America as a montage of Hollywood and Fifth Avenue, whether they dwell in our midst or have never stepped on American soil, doubtless owe their faith to Hollywood, Madison Avenue and Wall Street. They may as well believe they know each crater and hill on the moon.

dissociate itself from the European theatre. And when World War II broke out, too many American stakes were involved to let isolationism prevail.

Also involved, however, was a moral angle which more than anything else precipitated the mutual renegation within the camps of both isolationists and interventionists. The intolerable situation that Europe was reduced to by American intervention in 1917 turned World War II into the second act of one and the same strug-

gle. Had the United States, after precipitating this situation, not participated in Act II of the tragedy, Europe would have emerged as one big Nazi colony, dooming her own civilization and challenging the rest of the world. It was this nightmarish prospect which caused a complete realignment of the supporters and the opponents of war. The liberal isolationists of 1917 became in 1941 the most fervent interventionists, and many of the fervent interventionists of 1917 became stubborn

isolationists in 1941. Spiritually and politically, each of the two renegating camps remained faithful to its values and social vision.

If history indicts President Roosevelt as charged by the naval commanders of Pearl Harbor, the moral guilt for his action will have to be relegated to Woodrow Wilson. It remains pure speculation whether a Roosevelt born a generation earlier would have been in 1917 as staunch an interventionist as he actually was in 1941.

From READERS' LETTERS

FROM "THE OTHER SIDE"

My deepest thanks to you for sending me a copy of *THE MINORITY OF ONE*, containing the open letter to me. It is always enormously interesting to hear the other side of a viewpoint.

Thank you, too, for your kindness in offering me the use of your forum to reply to this letter. I don't think I will avail myself of it, but I do appreciate your fairness in making the offer.

Rosser Reeves
Chairman of the Board
TED BATES & Co., INC.

New York, N. Y.

(The above is in response to "An Open Letter to a Prominent Advertising Agency" in the March issue of *THE MINORITY OF ONE*.)

~

FROM ANOTHER MINORITY OF ONE

... The title of your publication is well chosen—few people seek truth today, truth being the existing reality that so few people have the courage to face.

... For the past ten years I have tried through my teaching profession to open the doors of many minds. I have been shunned, feared, persecuted, fired, scoffed at, laughed at, and just recently told to shut up because I "stir up people". But, I have never had a chance to actually be allowed freedom of speech to debate issues openly with the power elite that breathes down my neck and pays my salary. If a society is brainwashed, I won't hesitate to say that ours is far out in front.

... On one of my teaching assignments I was actually told by the local stooges of the power elite that I should not be teaching at the high school level but at a higher one. I countered that all age levels must be stimulated to think. This was met with silence and submission of resignation papers, coupled with good recommendations. So to say the least, my life is anything but dull. The last thing I'll ever admit is that I am a well adjusted person in our society, because admitting this I would also be admitting being ill. A society that engages in a mad pursuit of wealth for wealth's sake and delights in it at the expense of basic dignities of humanity, and at the same time proclaims the opposite, needs above all to take a good, long and cold look at itself with all the honesty and humility it does not possess but needs to acquire. Truth remains buried.

From another minority of one,
Eugene T. Bernhardt

Petaluma, Calif.

~

THINKS TO THINK OF THINKING . . .

Your magazine makes me think about things I never thought to think about.

Lois Morgan

Broderick, Calif.

~

WANTS COPIES TO BE SENT ABROAD

I am a high school student. We have a club at school on projects for the improvement of international relations. We send good American magazines overseas. Your uniquely unbiased magazine would show the recipients in India, Africa and Indonesia that the U. S. A. is a place where healthy political attitudes can exist. We would greatly appreciate copies of past issues, so they can be used for that purpose.

Richard B. Gaber

Wilmette, Ill.

NOTHING TO ARGUE ABOUT

... The reason I hadn't sent my subscription in sooner is: I was waiting for a friend to decide about subscribing. He isn't, but we'll remain friends . . .

It's a bit uncanny, I suppose, that I, who like to think of myself as a rebel in "present-day political-thinking-circles", could not take exception to anything written in either the January or February issues. I'm used to disagreeing with almost everybody on something or other, yet I have the (uncomfortable) feeling that we would have to dig deep to find a topic to argue about.

I think I've found such a topic, however. While the format of *THE MINORITY OF ONE* is pleasant to behold, the newspaper-like makeup and continuation of articles makes it harder to read. I for one would prefer each article all in one place, and I am curious as to whether you are willing to find out if other readers agree with me. The change would leave you more time for research and to ponder on topics for future issues, and since you are probably not entered in any scholastic newspaper competitions anyway, no harm should come from the loss of makeup.

Mitchell Krasny

Takoma Park, Md.

~

IN DUE TIME WE WILL COME TO IT

... You have certainly got some interesting things to say. I would like to hear your thoughts on the Rosenberg case in a future issue. I especially liked *The Bigot* (February issue). I feel it has helped me to understand myself better. Keep talking; I will keep on listening.

J. A. Gilpatrick

Edgewater, N. J.

~

NO, NO, NO "HEIL EDGAR!"

I received your March issue which I was reading with interest until I hit a sour note on page 7, which called for the possible election of J. Edgar Hoover, God forbid!, as president.

Are you serious? It is so contrary to the portions I had read before turning to that one. How in heaven's name could J. Edgar be better than Nixon or McCarthy?

You leave me confused.

Lola Boswell

Washington, D. C.

EDITOR'S NOTE: We are sorry and embarrassed that the irony of the piece referred to above was so subtle as to escape a reader's perception. CERTAINLY, we were not serious!

~

WELCOME TO THE FIRST BOOK CUSTOMER

What a pleasure to read *THE MINORITY OF ONE*! I feel I have missed something for all these years. In fact, . . . I have received a copy of the second issue, but wish to have a file of all the issues printed. Please, let me know whether they are available, and the price.

Your articles on democracy are tops. Please, try to publish a book on the subject. It would be tops for all high schools. In fact it should be used as paperbacks, textbook, and be broadcast all over the world.

I shall try to do my best to introduce *THE MINORITY OF ONE* to anyone I come in contact with.

Keep up the good work.

John Holovac

Donora, Pa.

Germany Back to May, 1941

(Continued from page 1)

German reunification, he makes it absolutely impossible by insisting that a reunited Germany should enjoy the liberty of joining any military block. Little surprise that the Soviets are uninclined to support a belated execution of the Rudolf Hess Doctrine. . . .

The zealousness with which German muscles are made available pre-conditions, like nothing else, the course of American foreign policy. This zealousness has never allowed our statesmen to pause, reflect, and re-examine the wisdom of the cold war. Adenauer insists on perpetuating a completely abnormal situation in Berlin in order to preserve a sore spot between the West and the Soviet Union—and our Government obligingly complies. Adenauer holds a proxy over this country's policy, not only towards Germany, but also towards the Soviet Union.

This policy has lately produced such worrisome events that it is high time the Western world paused to reflect on where it is being pushed by Dr. Adenauer. There can be little doubt that West-German efforts to obtain foreign military bases, including some in Spain, had the consent, if not outright encouragement, of Western diplomatic circles. Indeed no official denials are convincing in view of the credibility of German contentions that their efforts were approved by Secretary of State Christian Herter himself, and in view of U. S. Ambassador Dowling's official blessing of the plan. This course seems so well concerted that it was accompanied by renewed American threats of unilateral expansion of the air-corridor to Berlin and plans to create a nuclear task force within NATO.

The implications inherent in the establishment of foreign military bases by Germany are so fateful and frightful that a point of no return may soon be reached in the prevailing impasse between the Western powers and the Soviet Union. Propagandistically, the bitter pill has been sugar coated with the contention that German military expansion serves nothing but the training of German troops. But one need not be a military expert to perceive the actual intention to provide convenient launching sites for German missiles and circumvent the prohibition on building atomic weapons on German soil.

If such a situation is allowed to develop, international negotiations will be reduced to no more than the delaying tactics necessary for a prudent timing of an eventual attack.

It is quite possible that the use of new threats, especially the talk of establishing German foreign bases, is intended merely to create pre-summit diplomatic assets. Even if this is so, we can "rely" on Dr. Adenauer to do his best to convert such diplomatic "assets" into actual assets in the German armory. This fateful catastrophe must be prevented!

A Personal Note From The Editor:

You may have wondered where the financial means that make this costly publication possible come from. When I tell you that I myself, a man of very limited income, am its sole financial backer, you may also wonder what inspires this sacrifice.

From certain articles in **THE MINORITY OF ONE** you may have noted that being a Jew I was incarcerated in German concentration camps for five years. There I saw thousands of people, including my father, my mother and my sister, die of starvation and tortures, in gas chambers and before firing squads. I myself was subjected to tortures I did not believe a human being could endure.

Yet, I survived. Frankly, one who sees his entire social environment wiped out cannot help being obsessed by an irrational feeling of guilt for surviving himself. It is as if I had to justify my survival by serving justice and humanity as best I understand them.

I have seen men like you and me, loyal to their families, adoring their children, even caring for their pets commit the most heinous bestialities. What shook me to the very depth of my being was the stark realization that men, not unlike myself in their feelings and motivations, were nevertheless capable of such utter acts of violence and brutality. Reluctantly, I admitted that no inherent dignity rendered me immune to committing similar bestialities. Fearfully, I believed that all human beings contain in themselves the same shocking potential.

What then, I was forced to ask myself, transformed a mere human being into a bloodthirsty, monstrous SS man? I believe it was his personal

weakness and self-doubt leading to blind trust in the state's infallibility and substituting this external reliance for a personal conscience. Out of this sacrifice of conscience, this self-negation and reverence for the state's authority, he was driven to participate in the most atrocious crimes unaware of the horror of his deeds.

These thoughts awakened me to a responsibility for alerting my fellow man to intellectual and moral self-assertion. We must never sacrifice personal conscience to any external infallibility lest we too participate in injustices without being aware of them. It is this idea I believe **THE MINORITY OF ONE** is serving.

The response to **THE MINORITY OF ONE** has been enthusiastic, but unfortunately, since I refuse to commercialize the venture or to accept financial support from any political quarters, and since my own personal savings as well as all the indemnity I received from the German Government are exhausted, a point has been reached where the continuation of this publication is endangered just when its continuation seems to bear a promise of eventual self-support. I am not asking for any personal help; **THE MINORITY OF ONE** is not intended for profits. But I am asking for your help in making this forum continue.

More than outright contributions we need gift subscriptions from those who give us moral support. If you will enter gift subscriptions for your friends and ask them to do likewise, a chain reaction will result which will see us through.

The timing of your help is of crucial importance. If you intend to respond to this appeal, please do it **NOW**. You will be that much better and richer for doing it.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

THE MINORITY OF ONE, INC.
P. O. Box 6594
Richmond 30, Va.

Please, enter my subscription for

☐ 1 year — \$5.00 (In Canada \$5.25)

☐ 2 years — \$9.00 (In Canada \$9.50)

☐ Enclosed is my contribution of
\$..... to your publication fund.

NAME.....

St. & No.....

City.....
(ZONE) (STATE)

Also enter gift subscriptions at the rate of
\$4.00 per year for:

M

1. NAME.....

St. & No.....

City.....
(ZONE) (STATE)

2. NAME.....

St. & No.....

City.....
(ZONE) (STATE)

Acknowledge gift subscriptions in the name of

☐ Remittance enclosed

☐ Bill me

☐ I further suggest you mail free sample copies to the parties listed by me separately.

Signature

THE MINORITY OF ONE • April 1960 • Page 15

Of What I Am Ashamed:

► OF the war games conducted by the U. S. and five Latin-American governments in the Caribbean area with their implicit threat to all in Latin America who, like Castro's Cuba, refuse to "behave".

► OF the congressional uproar against the consideration given to Uruguayan humanitarian sentiments in California Governor Brown's stay of execution of Caryl Chessman, coming as it does from the same quarters who insist on American "influence" upon foreign countries.

► OF the Montgomery, Alabama police for preventing 2,000 Negroes from holding a protest meeting against segregation at the Alabama Capitol, and for arresting on another occasion 30 students and teachers who participated in a protest demonstration.

► OF former Federal Communications Commission chairman John C. Doerfer for accepting payola hospitality on the yacht and private plane of George B. Storer, owner of 13 radio and television stations under FCC jurisdiction.

► OF the State Department's refusal to accept Cuba's request that the U. S. refrain from punitive economic measures while talks are under way to normalize relations between the two countries.

► OF Air Force Secretary Dudley C. Sharp's unprincipled appeasement of the House Committee on Un-American Activities by conceding that references to Communism in American churches and schools in the now-revoked 1955 AF security guide were unobjectionable and "proper . . . in a manual of this type".

► OF the elaborate employment of jet aircraft, helicopters, the Navy band, etc., etc. to accompany President Eisenhower on his Latin-American tour.

► OF the claim by Maj. General W. T. Hefley, commander of the Air Force Air Materiel Command in Europe, that Americans who live abroad for a number of years "are not good citizens of the United States and should turn in their passports".

► OF President Eisenhower's vetoing of a bill to boost federal aid to control river pollution from \$500 million to \$900 million for the next ten years.

► OF the drug industry's peddling of incompletely evaluated drugs "which not infrequently are hazardous" as claimed by Dr. Haskell J. Weinstein and Dr. Martin A. Seidell, former research directors for Charles Pfizer & Co., before the congressional Kefauver committee.

► OF the campaign of intimidation conducted by the police of Nashville, Tenn., Montgomery, Ala., Richmond and Petersburg, Va. and other Southern communities against Negroes for protesting against segregation.

► OF the Southern Senators filibuster intended to prevent civil rights legislation even though it has been watered down to the point of virtual inertia.

► OF President Eisenhower's demand for legislation that would empower him to curtail the Cuban sugar quota and of his cynical defiance of truth, during a recent press conference, in denying the punitive intention of such action against the Castro regime.

THE MINORITY OF ONE . . . *

Gutenberg's invention of modern printing gave mankind not only a revolutionary means for exchanging ideas but also a powerful weapon for manipulating man's mind.

Of all of man's rights and liberties the most precious one is freedom of thought. It is the quintessence of freedom. As George Orwell put it: "Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows."

Of all oppressions the oppression of thought operates through the subtlest channels. It is incomparably less conspicuous than starvation, denial of political rights, or corporal abuse. Like a tasteless poison, it attacks the victim without warning.

One particular form of thought oppression is the most degrading of human experiences; its victims are masses of volunteers, mentally anaesthetized by orthodoxy and conformity. Again to quote Orwell: "Orthodoxy means not thinking—not needing to think. Orthodoxy is unconsciousness." Orthodoxy is mental suicide.

THE MINORITY OF ONE will tear away at the invisible chains of the mind. It will exercise the right of saying that two plus two make four, paying no heed to political taboos.

We believe that the ultimate test of a civilization's worthiness and ability to survive lies in the quality of the individuals it produces. Hurrah-patriotism, flag waving, and blind, nationalistic self-contentment are no substitutes. In the fierce international competition of our era, they will prove not only futile, but also detrimental to our society. If we are to be both worthy and able to survive the Communist challenge, we must be prepared to make a national virtue of self-criticism.

Self-criticism is not inimical to patriotism. On the contrary, it is an indispensable ingredient of genuine concern and devotion to one's society. Otherwise, only the stupid could be patriotic . . .

To retain its independence, THE MINORITY OF ONE will not be open to commercial advertising. Its success will depend entirely on the support of its readers. We trust that those who welcome truly free discussion will not only themselves become subscribers, but also help us to reach their friends.

* Introductory article from the first issue.

THE MINORITY OF ONE carries no specific political message. Its name derives from its purpose—to contribute to the individual's intellectual self-assertion. You and I are the minorities of one, if only we do not fear our thoughts. Our thoughts may collide, or they may coincide or complement each other, but even then let us each remain a minority of one. If you lend us support on this, no matter how many of our specific views you may dissent from, we believe you to be our friend.

P. O. Box 6594
Richmond 30, Va.

Bulk Rate
U. S. Postage
PAID
Richmond, Va.
Permit No. 1519

Return Postage
Guaranteed